

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,139	06/20/2003	Keith Weinstein	PMW1110-2	5941
28213	7590 03/21/2006		EXAMINER	
DLA PIPER	R RUDNICK GRAY CA	ARY US, LLP	WYSZOMIERS	KI, GEORGE P
	JTIVE DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
-SUITE 1100 SAN DIEGO	), CA 92121-2133		1742	

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			5
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/601,139	WEINSTEIN, KEITH	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	George P. Wyszomierski	1742	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	ess
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timulated and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this common (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
<ul> <li>1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 Ja</u></li> <li>2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This</li> <li>3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E</li> </ul>	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pro		nerits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-19 is/are pending in the approach 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3-7 and 9 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 2,10-14 and 18 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 15,16,17 and 19 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR	• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National St	age
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te	52)

Application/Control Number: 10/601,139 Page 2

Art Unit: 1742

1. Claims 2, 10, 11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a) In claim 10, line 3, it appears that the phrase "about 2% to 14% by weight" should be deleted, i.e. the <u>alloy</u> referred to in the preamble of the claim is not 2-14% of the recited elements, but rather 2-14% of the overall composition of the solder.
- b) In claims 2 and 11, it is unclear whether the copper defined in these claims is a part of the copper defined in the independent claims, or a separate component of the claimed composition. Further, the claims recites 8% to 80% silver, while the independent claims require a minimum of 25% gold and 2% other elements, and claims 2 and 11 also require a minimum of 5% zinc, so it is unclear how the 80% level could be attained in a manner consistent with the remainder of the claimed limitations.
- c) It appears that line 2 of claim 18 should be rewritten as "and about 2% to 14% by weight of an alloy for lowering the melting point of the solder comprising".
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 10, 12, 13, 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz (U.S. Patent 4,591,483).

Nawaz discloses alloys containing 20-65% gold, and which may further comprise gallium, indium and copper in amounts overlapping the amounts as defined in the instant

Art Unit: 1742

claims. Nawaz does not disclose any specific examples having the Ga:In:Cu ratio as presently claimed. However, the composition as broadly recited in e.g. claim 1 of Nawaz overlaps the composition as presently claimed. In view of the overlap, the disclosure of Nawaz is held to create a prima facie case of obviousness of the presently clamed invention because Nawaz indicates that the prior art compositions possess utility over the entire range as claimed in the prior art patent. Compare In re Malagari (182 USPQ 549).

Page 3

4. In a response filed January 4, 2006, Applicant alleges that the melting temperature of the Nawaz alloys are significantly higher than those presently claimed. Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered, but are not applicable to the rejected claims because these claims do not recite any specific melting temperature. With respect to dental alloys in Nawaz versus solder in the instant claims, this is held to be nothing more than a difference in intended use of the claimed materials, and does not define any difference between the actual compositions of the prior art and those of the instant claims.

The terminal disclaimer filed on January 4, 2006 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of U.S. Patent 6,372,060 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

All amendments made in the January 4, 2006 response appear to be fully supported by the specification as originally filed. The last line of claim 10 appears to find support at paragraph [0023] of the specification.

Application/Control Number: 10/601,139 Page 4

Art Unit: 1742

5. Claims 1, 3-7 and 9 are allowable over the prior art of record, and claims 15, 16, 17 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Wyszomierski whose telephone number is (571) 272-1252. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King, can be reached on (571) 272-1244. All patent application related correspondence transmitted by facsimile must be directed to the <u>new central facsimile number</u>, (571)-273-8300. This new Central FAX Number is the result of relocating the Central FAX server to the Office's Alexandria, Virginia campus.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GPW March 16, 2006